



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/042,236

01/11/2002

George M. Halow

15345.4002

4880

64004 7590 04/17/2009

STRASBURGER & PRICE, LLP
901 MAIN STREET
SUITE 4400
DALLAS, TX 75202

EXAMINER

PORTER, RACHEL L

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3626

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

04/17/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES

Ex parte GEORGE HALOW & LOUIS ZUNIGA

Appeal 2007-4550
Application 10/042,236
Technology Center 3600

Mailed: April 17, 2009

Before DALE M. SHAW, *Chief Appeals Administrator*

ORDER REMANDING APPEAL TO EXAMINER

This application was electronically received at the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences on July 31, 2007. A Docketing Notice was mailed and Appeal No. 2007-4550 was assigned on September 29, 2007. A review of the application has revealed that the application was not ready for an appeal. Accordingly, the application is herewith being remanded to the Examiner. The matter requiring attention is identified below.

Claims 13-21 of the instant application are set forth as method claims that may not fall with one of the four statutory categories of invention recited in 35 U.S.C. § 101. On May 15, 2008, the Deputy Commissioner for Patent Examining Policy, John J. Love, issued a memorandum entitled “Clarification of “Processes” under 35 U.S.C. § 101.” This memorandum is further used in conjunction with the Interim Guidelines and the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure § 2106.IV.B, when determining whether a claimed invention falls within a statutory category of invention. *See In re Bilski*, 545 F.3d 943 (Fed. Cir. 2008)(en banc). Thus, there is a question as to whether claims 13-21 meet the requirements of being a patent eligible process under 35 U.S.C. § 101.

Accordingly, it is

ORDERED that the application is remanded to the Examiner to determine if claims 13-21 meet the requirements of being a patent eligible process under 35 U.S.C. § 101.

If there are any questions pertaining to this order, please contact the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences at 571-272-9797.

DMS/tdl

Strasburger & Price, LLP
901 Main Street
Suite 4400
Dallas, TX 75202